

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

29 April 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: LTC WATT

SUBJECT: Events of 23-25 April 1980 (U)

(1) <sup>co</sup> 1. (S) Altering the established life cycles of remote viewing personnel does not appear to be beneficial to the remote viewing process. I am not saying it is detrimental to the process, but that clear thinking and sound judgment fall off without sufficient sleep, is certain. The psychological "high" of working on a special problem may serve to counter this affect for a period of time. How much better (if at all) would the remote viewing process be if the psychological "high" could be attained without the loss of sleep inherent in altering established life cycles?

(1) <sup>co</sup> pfd 2. (S) Scheduling of a large number of remote viewing sessions was a problem for all personnel concerned (except for the customer). A three-hour cycle would appear to be workable. For example:

1300 RVer and IVer arrive at site  
1315 RVer goes to RV room and IVer gets mission brief  
1330 IVer joins RVer in RV room  
1400 OT time  
1500-1530 Complete RV~~ers~~  
1530 IVer briefs analyst  
1600 IVer ready for new RVer

At this rate the IVer could do three RV sessions (9 hours) before taking a break. The RVers should be tasked around this basic schedule. A team of IVers could work around the clock, nine-hours on nine-hours off. A RVer might then do one RV session every 9 hour period; maybe more if the targets were sufficiently different.

3. (S) Last week we limited ourselves to doing RV sessions simultaneously. The only reason we had done simultaneous sessions previously was when the targets were the same so we could obtain multiple opinions. Many of last week's simultaneous sessions were not against the same target so the advantage of multiple opinions was not a factor. Something might be said for the information pertaining to "same time" concepts. For example, at 2100 the status of target "A" was thus and the status of target "B" was thus. I would suggest, however, that obtaining multiple opinions about the same target would be more valuable. If "same time" information is required about different targets then it is possible to simply target the time required. To avoid multiple futures theory problems, the aforementioned method should be applied to near past circumstances only. Your plan worked well to provide maximum intelligence in the shortest time possible, but an alternate idea might have been to provide a continuous flow of intelligence (sessions?) by scheduling similar to the 3-hour cycle explained in paragraph 2, above.

CLASSIFIED BY: MSG, DAMI-ISI  
051630Z Jul 78

~~SECRET~~  
~~SECURITY~~

*Re: Tony*  
③  
4. (C) I think we could have had one more room at the hotel. This would have allowed for a separate area for administrative functions. The RV rooms should be for RVing only, as we have talked about before. A casual break room is necessary, and it just didn't seem to work having the break room/admin room together.

5. (S) I am not familiar with the results of our effort because I was only exposed to my compartmental segment of the operation. Hearing you talk, apparently over all, we did quite well. It might have been interesting to have continued our targeting of the compound for another day. If we could have kept all personnel "blind" to what was happening it would have been a good opportunity to validate our remote viewing efforts. Could the viewers have detected the rescue failure and the subsequent activity of the militants?

6. (U) Let me take this opportunity to congratulate you on a job well done. Your job is a thankless position, constantly under criticism from all directions. I know thanks from superiors is nicer than from me, but for what it's worth I appreciate your efforts during this difficult period.

*Fredrick H. Atwater*  
FREDERICK H. ATWATER  
1LT, MI  
Training Officer

On a personal note, I was very concerned about you during the past few days. You seemed to be pushing yourself too hard. Take care of yourself.

P.S. Get an OPS OFFICER!

(A) *tony*

~~SECRET~~  
~~SECURITY~~